

USE OF DATA: PILOT STUDY
MARCH, 2008

Elaine Ackerman,
Assessment Director

John Hoover,
Associate Dean

Report No. Datause.08.1

USE OF DATA: PILOT STUDY MARCH, 2008

Introduction and Method

In the fall of 2006 Dean Steffens charged the Assessment Committee with the task of systemizing feedback from programs regarding the dissemination of assessment data. An issue determined to be even more important by members of the committee and the dean was to pilot and then institute a method for accomplishing the following three institutional goals related to assessment practices:

- Documenting that program faculty had considered the information in disseminated reports
- Determining whether program modifications or consideration of such changes could be tracked to the collection and dissemination of assessment data
- Provision of a feedback loop to the assessment committee so that reports could be improved and studies could be developed that targeted the specific data needs perceived by program representatives

In an iterative process, the *Assessment Data Feedback* format shown in [Appendix A](#) was developed. The form was designed to directly address the three goals shown above. Members of the unit assessment committee proposed that the form be submitted to program representatives along with each report disseminated.

It was clear from the beginning that it would be difficult for program faculty members to modify programs based on unit-wide reports. However, it was determined that, since the unit-wide reports provided the big picture, it was important to document that faculty members were reading and entering the information into their deliberations.

In an effort to track progress on the assessment feedback loop, responses to the first 14 returns of the feedback (“use-of-data) form were analyzed with an eye toward evaluating the process. Tables 1-6 contains data from the forms(See Tables 1 through 6). Each table reflects responses to one of the reports disseminated by the assessment team:

[Table 1](#): Cooperating teachers ('03-'07)

[Table 2](#): Employer follow-up

[Table 3](#): Candidate self report ('04-'07)

[Table 4](#): Two-to-five-year follow-up

[Table 5](#): Praxis reports ('06-'07)

[Table 6](#): Performance-based (student teaching ('04-'07)

Based on these data and feedback provided directly during assessment committee meetings, the following conclusions are drawn and recommendations offered:

Conclusions

1. As anticipated, some difficulty was encountered by report readers in translating unit-wide data to the program perspective, a not unanticipated result, based on discussions in the assessment committee.
2. The “program vs. unit wide” issues was, however, not insurmountable. While each respondent requested disaggregated data (subsequently supplied based on these requests), several demonstrated the ability to integrated information from the unit-wide report with information that they had collected on program candidates.
3. In anticipation of the need for disaggregated data, reports were written for all programs where at least 10 data points were available.

4. At least two members of the assessment committee opined that the feedback form proved too complicated. This information centered around two themes: First, one program chair reported that the form itself was too complicated. Another program coordinator, though supportive of the format, found that responding to unit-wide reports ended up taking more time than it was worth.
5. **Response rate.** Only about one in three program directors responded to the initial effort to collect these data. This suggests that the members of the unit assessment committee, representatives of the dean, and the assessment director need to continue efforts to collect, analyze and use the information. Unit members must continue to “live” the process by demonstrating that they consider and ultimately use assessment data.
6. Respondents clearly understood the information provided in the reports and could, in many cases, relate it to programmatic data and trace both strengths and weaknesses to practices at the unit and program level.
7. Respondents were consistent in identifying unit and program strengths; the following strengths were not questioned, suggesting that they represent valid themes for future growth: (a) diversity preparation, (b) respect for all students, (c) high expectations for all, (d) candidate ability to affect student learning, and (e) dispositions related to the field.
8. Responding program coordinators identified consistent areas for growth in the unit, though they also questioned the applicability of these to programs: (a)

Assessment practices, (b) curriculum development. Minnesota graduation standards were mentioned several times, but these have been replaced since the survey instrument was developed (replaced with a series of examinations). The item needs to be removed from instruments.

9. The format successfully generated requests for reanalysis and further data analyses as intended. As mentioned above, program-level reports associated with *Candidate self-reports* and *Cooperating teacher surveys* have been disseminated as of March 20, 2008.

Recommendations

1. Despite the issues raised above, the *Assessment data [feedback](#) format* should continue to be collected for both program and unit-wide reports.
2. In light of item #4, the assessment committee should revisit the form. Also, the message should be disseminated that members of the committee understand that written responses to unit-wide reports are mostly intended to document dissemination.
3. Training sessions related to use of the format should be undertaken.
4. When it is possible to do so, program-level reports should be disseminated at the same time or shortly after distribution of unit-wide data.
5. Given the strong desire for program-level data, a system needs to be enacted for collecting qualitative feedback for very small programs. At present, program-level data are not disseminated for programs with fewer than 10 completers.

Table 1. Use of Data in the Unit: Cooperating Teachers study (return to [text](#)).

Cooperating Teachers: Unit Wide and Program Area Reports (2003-2007)					
Program/ Person Reporting	Report/ Date Considered	Strengths (+ Supporting Data)	Needs (+ Supporting Data)	Proposed Programmatic Responses	Information Requests
Art Education Kathryn Gainey	Cooperating Teachers: Unit- Wide 11/28/07	Most indicators positive, especially diversity Data matches Art Education praxis data—above average	Lowest domain was curriculum Implementation of grad standards	State coordinator of art standards invited to speak each semester on standards Addition of portfolio review at first transition point More content on assessment in art considered	Disaggregate data for art majors (this was completed)
Secondary/ K- 12 Leslie Davidson	Cooperating teachers 2004- 2007: Unit Wide 12/10/07	Dispositions listed as a unit-wide strengths Diversity Professionalism Ratings of university supervisors	Assessment, at least on a unit- wide basis	Strengths cited probably reflect the addition of disposition material and ratings in several courses Strengths also reflect requirement for HURL courses related to diversity	Add items to instrument or occasionally survey re level of expectations for assessment and opportunity for praxis re assessment during student teaching <i>Note:</i> Disaggregation in response to this request is underway
Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Sport Management Caryl Martin	Cooperating Teacher data: HPERSS ('04-'07) Program Report 3/08	Overall, CTs rate physical education teachers strong Some improvement is noted over the past five years	Implement graduation standards Note: Poor item because graduate standards have been eliminated Assessment?	Strengthening programming vis formal assessment (F '07) Will track data	Identify types of assessments employed by physical education teachers in the schools

Table 2. Use of Data in the Unit: Principal/ Employer follow up data (return to [text](#)).

Principal/ Employer Follow-Up Study					
Program/ Person Reporting	Report/ Date Considered	Strengths (+ Supporting Data)	Needs (+ Supporting Data)	Proposed Programmatic Responses	Information Requests
Communication Arts and Literature Raymond Philippot	Principal/ Employer survey: Unit-Wide 3.24/08	Half of leavers rated as exceeding expectations in all areas by employers	Not easy to determine from this report	It is difficult to determine meaning of this unit-wide report for CAL program	Disaggregated employment data needed
Art Education Kathryn Gainey	Employer (Principal) study 3/20/08	Candidates rated high in INTASC standards	None cited	Increased connections between SCSU candidates and principals	Increase response rate Suggested telephone survey
Science Education Mark Minger	Employer data: Unit Wide 3/24/08	None	Content knowledge	These data suggest the need to discuss the proportion of pedagogy to content knowledge courses Adding SCI 227 for middle school based on past sets of data (Praxis) suggesting needs for more content Added online study guides for PRAXIS II study	Disaggregate data for science majors Separate elementary and secondary
Communication Arts and Literature Raymond Philippot	Employer Data; Unit Wide) 3/24/08	About ½ of SCSU-prepared educators rated as exceeding expectations	Difficult to determine from report	Need disaggregated data	Need disaggregated data

Table 3. Use of Data in the Unit: Candidate self-report data (return to [text](#)).

Self Report (immediate Follow-Up) (2004-2007)					
Program/ Person Reporting	Report/ Date Considered	Strengths (+ Supporting Data)	Needs (+ Supporting Data)	Proposed Programmatic Responses	Information Requests
Secondary/ K-12 Leslie Davidson	Self-Report: Unit Wide (04-07) 12/10/07	Valuing human diversity Creating positive learning environment Respecting individual differences Candidates' ability to facilitate active engagement in students Candidates valued the field of education	Analyze curriculum Communicating student progress Implementing graduation standards Licensure issues	Monitor data and, if consistent, proposed working directly with cooperating teachers so that candidates could have more experiences with curriculum analysis and preparation, assessment, and implementation of state standards during student teaching experience Work on programmatic materials to address needs—add materials to secondary handbook	Data need to be disaggregated; <i>Note:</i> This has been done in light of this request
Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Sport Management Caryl Martin	Self-Report Data: Physical Education ('04-'07) 3/08	Strengths similar to those found in Cooperating Teacher data See below	Licensure issues Legal issues A broader approach to curriculum needed	Added licensure, legal issues, and more on curriculum to <i>Organization and Administration</i> course. Though subject matter has always been included, added reflection piece to above-named course	Need more self-report data to determine employment patterns Add open-ended question for HPERSS majors related to “program changes...recommend...to better prepare you
Art Education Kathryn Gainey	Self Assessment: Unit Wide (2004-2007) 11/28/07	Overall high scores Confirms content knowledge Campus commitment to diversity	Graduation standards Art education students confirm this informally	Expert on state (no longer graduate) standards brought to class Portfolio review at first transition point Interview for admission to major	Disaggregate data on art education majors (completed as of this writing)
Center for Information Media Mert Thompson	Self Assessment: Unit Wide (04-07) 12/13/07	Dispositions rated positively Work reflects professional and state standards	Community resources Professional conduct/code of ethics	BOT standards changed. This information needs to be worked into program Will review curriculum for alignment when amended standards are made available	Need disaggregated data Larger sample size

Table 4. Use of Data in the Unit: Two-to-five-year follow-up study (return to [text](#)).

Two-to-Five-Year Follow Up Study					
Program/ Person Reporting	Report/ Date Considered	Strengths (+ Supporting Data)	Needs (+ Supporting Data)	Proposed Programmatic Responses	Information Requests
Secondary/ K-12 Leslie Davidson	Two-to Five-year Follow Up: Unit- Wide) 3/24/08	Respect for diversity Impact on student learning Can trace these strengths to specific coursework in K-12 (they do their own surveys). Matches programmatic findings	Professional development Assessment Development of meaningful relationship with parents	If data continues to demonstrate weaknesses, consider adding “community relationships” content and praxis to ED 441 (field portion) Consider working with cooperating teachers to ameliorate weaknesses in professional development and assessment	Data should be disaggregated for PK-12 and 5-12
Communication Arts and Literature Raymond Philippot	Two-to Five-year Follow Up: Unit- Wide 3/24/08	Candidates viewed overall preparation program as positive Particular strengths = diversity, impact on student learning, high expectations (diversity)	Areas unit wide= assessment (monitoring instruction), professional development,	Need disaggregated data to determine	Need disaggregated data to determine
Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Sport Management Caryl Martin	Two-to Five-year Follow Up: Unit- Wide) 3/24/08	None related to program	None related to program	Data need to be disaggregated	Data Need to be disaggregated
Art Education Kathryn Gainey	Two-to-Five Year Follow Up Study (Unit-Wide) 3/20/08	Positive attitude toward teaching profession	Assessment/ believes that this is also true in art education program	Await posting of new art standards on state’s web site	Minnesota standards
Social Studies Education Kyle Ward	Two-to-five year follow-up study: Unit Wide 3/08	Diversity preparation Affecting student learning	Difficult to determine: Need disaggregated data	Attempt to focus social studies methods course on topic of assessment Will be added during fall of 08	Disaggregate data Greater sample size

Table 5. Use of Data in the Unit: Praxis Reports (return to [text](#)).

Praxis Reports					
Program/ Person Reporting	Report/ Date Considered	Strengths (+ Supporting Data)	Needs (+ Supporting Data)	Proposed Programmatic Responses	Information Requests
Technology Education Kurt Helgeson	PRAXIS Series Principles of T & Learning Technology Education PRAXIS II	100% pass rate [on both exams] for 06-07 Tech ED majors	Weakest sub-domain was <i>Information & Communication Technologies</i>	Members of program have discussed changes No formal changes proposed at present	None requested
Teachers of English as a Second Language Jim Robinson	Praxis I and Praxis II	SCSU candidates scored at average level in statewide sample Diverse learners Learning environments Communication	Assessment Technology	Emphasize technology and assessment more in upcoming years Participate more directly in student teaching (new courses) Spring 2008	Need sub-scores on PRAXIS II Correlate PRAXIS scores with scores in program

Table 6. Use of Data in the Unit: Performance-based (student teaching) data (return to [text](#)).

Performance Based (Student teaching) Data					
Program/ Person Reporting	Report/ Date Considered	Strengths (+ Supporting Data)	Needs (+ Supporting Data)	Proposed Programmatic Responses	Information Requests
Art Education Kathryn Gainey	Performance Based (Unit-Wide, 05-07) 3/20/08	Both cooperating teachers and university supervisors generally rate candidates' teaching skills high	Principle 8: Assessment was <i>relative</i> weakness	Attend to assessment more in art education methods courses Couch approach to assessment in language associated with new Mn art education standards	No request
Communication Arts and Literature Raymond Philippot	Performance Based (Student Teaching) (05-07) 3/24/08	Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors rated candidate performance generally high	Assessment (university supervisors & cooperating teachers) Dealing with diversity in the classroom (cooperating teachers only)	Need disaggregated data to determine relevance to CAL	Disaggregated data (completed and disseminated)

Appendix A
Assessment Data Feedback Format
(Return to [Table](#) of Tables)
(Return to [recommendations](#))

Department, Program, or Unit:

Date of Meeting:

Person Completing Form:

Report of Information Considered:

1. Based upon the above report(s), provide evidence for particular programmatic **strengths**, if appropriate. Cite other data or information sources that confirm program strengths or that disconfirm them:
2. Based upon the above report(s), cite evidence for areas that demonstrate **need for improvement**, if any. If it is useful please cite other information that confirm or disconfirm “need” data from the current report.
3. Propose or consider **curricular, policy, or procedural changes**. Please list program changes that have been considered since the date of the last report and the information upon which the proposed changes were based.
4. Describe a prospective process for change, including timelines (if appropriate) and progress indicators.
5. **Need for more information**. Please enter requests for data (including reanalysis of the present data) related to the disseminated report.